UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,145	08/22/2003	Bong Cheol Kim	DE-1501	8727

1109 7590 06/01/2006

ANDERSON, KILL & OLICK, P.C.
1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK,, NY 10020-1182

EXAMINER	
LAMM, MARINA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1617	

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/646,145	KIM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marina Lamm	1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *1* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *38-109* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) *38-109* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 38-72, drawn to a method to treat or prevent allergic or non-allergic inflammatory disease in a mammal, comprising administering an extract of hardy kiwifruit to the mammal, classified in class 424, subclass 725.

II. Claims 73-101, drawn to a composition comprising an extract of hardy kiwifruit and at least on additional active compound, classified in class 424, subclass 400+.

III. Claim 102, drawn to a method for preparing a composition for treatment or prevention of allergic or non-allergic inflammatory disease in a mammal, classified in class 424, subclass 400.

IV. Claims 103-109, drawn to a method to treat or prevent allergic or non-allergic inflammatory disease in a mammal, comprising administering hardy kiwifruit to the mammal, classified in class 424, subclass 725.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and IV are directed to related methods. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of

operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the methods use different products, i.e. extract of hardy kiwifruit (Group I) vs. hardy kiwifruit (Group IV), which are not capable of use together and are not obvious over one another since their chemical composition and physical form differ.

3. Inventions II and I are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the claimed process can be practiced with another materially different product such as persimmon leaf extract as shown in US 6,863,907.

4. Inventions II and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product such as a food product, e.g. ice cream with kiwi fruit flavor.

5. Inventions II and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case,

the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together (composition comprising an extract of hardy kiwifruit and at least on additional active compound of Group II vs. method of using hardy kiwifruit). Further, the different inventions have different modes of action.

6. Inventions III and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together (method of making a composition comprising an extract of hardy kiwifruit of Group III vs. method of using hardy kiwifruit). Further, the different inventions have different modes of action.

7. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

8. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not

commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

9. Election of species should be required prior to a search on the merits in all applications containing both species claims and generic or Markush claims. (MPEP 808.01(a)).

10. With respect to **Group I**, the application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed administering step:

a. administering extract as a pharmaceutical composition (e.g. tablet, powder, capsule, liquid, suspension, granule or syrup)

b. administering extract as a health food additive

c. administering extract in a cosmetic composition

These species are distinct because their forms, functions and effects differ. Accordingly, **if Group I is elected**, the Applicant is required to elect one of (a) – (c), even though this requirement is traversed. Alternatively, the Applicant is invited to acknowledge these types of administration are obvious in view of one another. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either

instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

11. With respect to **Group II**, the application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed additional active compounds:

d. vitamin or vitamin complex

e. natural antioxidant

f. pharmaceutically active compound for treating or preventing allergic disease or non-allergic inflammatory disease in a mammal, other than d) or e) above

These species are distinct because their structures and physicochemical properties differ. Accordingly, **if Group II is elected**, the Applicant is required to elect one or more elements from (d) - (f) to form a composition, even though this requirement is traversed. Applicant should include a chemical structure of the elected compound(s) if not already contained in the specification. Alternatively, the Applicant is invited to acknowledge these active agents are obvious in view of one another. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the

evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

12. In addition, the claims of **Group II** recite the following patentably distinct species of the claimed formulations:

g. pharmaceutical composition (e.g. tablet, powder, capsule, liquid, suspension, granule or syrup)

h. health food composition or food additive

i. cosmetic composition

These species are distinct because their forms, functions and effects differ. Accordingly, **if Group II is elected**, the Applicant is further required to elect one of (g) – (i), even though this requirement is traversed. Alternatively, the Applicant is invited to acknowledge these types of formulations are obvious in view of one another. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

13. To be complete, a response to the election of species requirement should include a proper election along with a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. MPEP 809.02(a).

14. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marina Lamm whose telephone number is (571) 272-0618. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 11am to 7pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan, can be reached at (571) 272-0629.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Marina Lamm, M.S., J.D.
Patent Examiner
5/18/06

SREENI PADMANABHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER